THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII JULY, 1954 No. 409

Editorial

THE articles in this number are intended to be informative rather than argumentative. When in 1950 the Convocations postponed for five years a definite decision about the relations between the Church of England and the Church of South India, it was recognized that it would be of the greatest importance to know how the C.S.I. developed during this period. Indeed, in 1950 the late Bishop of Oxford observed in Convocation that the process of development had already made the C.S.I. appear in a fresh light.

> "The Church of South India to-day (1950) was not the Church of South India which had been discussed at the Lambeth Conference (1948). It had grown and developed; it was beginning to feel its own feet; the result was that tendencies which as recently as eighteen months previously had been at best implicit in its constitution had become explicit. Things which eighteen months previously might have been described as no more than ideas and desires were now recognizable policy expressed in definite action."[1]

During the four years that have elapsed since then the process of development and clarification of character has continued, and we thought that THEOLOGY could best assist the Church of England to reach a definite decision in 1955 by supplying information direct from South India about what has actually happened there up to date and how the Church there is seen by those who are actually living and working in it. We should however explain that in three cases out of four we deliberately invited the testimony of men who are of the "Catholic" school of thought and who, by reason of their previous experience and theological convictions, have viewed with a specially critical eye those aspects of the Church concerning which there has been doubt or anxiety in sections of the Church of England. The other article, which is printed first and which we think will be found not the least interesting, is by an ex-congregationalist theologian who was disposed to view the united Church with a different cast of criticism.

We wish to leave these articles to speak for themselves, and no attempt has been made to ensure that their testimony is concordant. The only conclusion which at this stage we ourselves feel bound to draw is that in 1955 the Church of England will have no excuse for not reaching a definite decision about its relations with the Church of South India. We are inclined to believe that the capacity of our ecclesiastical leaders for contriving, and of our legislative assemblies for passing, resolutions that avoid or defer settling controversial issues has on several occasions been an advantage to our Church: in the present case, it may well have been so in 1950. But this art or gift can demoralize or degrade a Church if it becomes a habit. If the

[1] *Chronicle of Convocation of Canterbury, 1950*, No. 2, p. 210.

Church of England cannot make up its mind in 1955 about whether it ought or ought not to be in full communion with the Church of South India, it will be hopelessly discredited in the field of church relations. Non-episcopal churches would justly conclude that we are not in earnest when we ask them to take episcopacy into their systems, and when we insist to them, as we do in theory, that episcopacy is the guardian and agent of unity. Professor R. D. Whitehorn made this point when, speaking of the resumed consideration of the relation of the C. of E. to the C.S.I. in 1955, he said: "If a church which has become episcopal throughout—'taken episcopacy' not only into existing systems, but brought into being a new episcopal church, cannot be in communion in all its ministry with the Church of England, then every non-episcopal church will inevitably, as I see it, come to the conclusion that for the sole purpose of establishing intercommunion, it is not worth doing."[1]

A definite decision in 1955—one way or the other—will clear the air, and will relieve the Church of England of what otherwise will have become an intolerable burden of equivocation.

The Church of South India—A Church on the Move

When one is asked to say something about the C.S.I. the common temptation is to pick those points which may be quoted in praise or in criticism or in defence of the Church. This article does not claim to be entirely free from such a temptation. But what is aimed at here is rather to give something like a personal testimony of the author to what has happened and is happening in the C.S.I. An attempt is made to give as objective an account as is possible for one who believes that Church Union is the Will of God and knows that it has meant an enrichment of Christian life.

It will, perhaps, help the readers to know that the author belonged to that group of the Christian community in South India known before union as "L.M.S. Christians" and after union as "ex-congregationalists". Entering into the membership of the C.S.I. has meant to me a real spiritual pilgrimage. On the one hand, it has meant a definite step towards the removal of the scandal of disunity of which an evangelizing Church is constantly made aware. On the other hand, it has meant a widening of the experience of the Church. The plurality and divisiveness of the Christian denominations have always weakened the claims of the healing power of Christ and have often provided excuse for many non-Christians to remain unbaptized even after professing love for Christ. At a recent discussion in the Indian Parliament Hindu leaders described the work of Christian missions as "disrupting the unity of the majority community in India". Any attempt to remove this scandal of a disunited Church is certainly an essential element of Christian obedience. But Church Union is not merely something dictated by evangelistic expediency.

[1] See *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, January 1954, p. 36.

I can say that Church Union has enlarged my understanding of the purpose of God. It is sound theology to say that one's knowledge of salvation grows with the deepening of the experience of the membership in the Church. The C.S.I. has certainly meant to many a deepening of the experience of church membership and a deepening of the knowledge of the fullness of the Church. For many, the Church has ceased to be an organization with the limited bearings of a denomination and has become the growing realization of the salvation of God. The Ephesian figures of summing up of all things in Christ, or the edifice growing into a holy temple in the Lord, have at least dimly received some fresh relevance in the experience of the United Church.

I was not myself in India at the time of the inauguration of the C.S.I. I returned to India from abroad only in 1950, after the united Church had been in existence for three years. It was quite a thrilling experience to come into a church where there were many more evidences of the work of the Holy Spirit than in the Church I knew before. It was no longer a Church with fixed traditions, but a growing Church with fresh zeal for evangelism, a desire to learn from one another, and a longing for new expressions of fellowship. It did not take long before I became acquainted with many growing points of the Church. What follows is an account of those areas of the Church's life and thought which have impressed me most.

1. *Growing in unity.* First among my impressions stands the naturalness of the sense of unity that is growing in the Church. This is what is to be expected if, in spite of the many denominational differences, the Church is One. Superficial observers have described the Church as "nothing more than a federation" or as a "patchwork union". It is true that for many congregations the Union has not meant any radical changes in their life or outlook. To a large extent their worship and administration continue as before union. We have in the C.S.I. churches which continue to worship, for example, after the manner of the High Anglican tradition, strictly observing all rules about vestments, genuflexions, incense, candles, saints' days, and the like. We have also churches which continue to worship in the simple congregationalist or primitive methodist way. There are churches which continue to have conscientious objections to allowing non-episcopally ordained presbyters to adminster sacraments. There is no attempt in the Church to strike a mean between the various traditions and arrive at a certain uniformity acceptable to all. The C.S.I. believes that different traditions can continue to exist side by side. Uniformity is insisted on only in those matters and in that degree which are necessary for the maintenance of a corporate life and mutual fellowship. The different traditions, however, do not always remain side by side unchanged. They come under the mutual influence of one another and churches do more readily learn from each other in the C.S.I. Sometimes the mutual influence is on a very superficial level, mere unreflecting imitations of externals such as processions, vestments, and altar railings. We have also cases of some ex-Anglican churches suddenly becoming conscious of the "rights of a local congregation".

But along with the continuance of different traditions and the unthinking imitations of one another there is a growing sense of the unity of the Church and the sense of being a growing Church. The sense of unity the Church possesses is really remarkable. I have attended several Diocesan and Synod meetings and I have not come across a single occasion when a discussion betrayed any difference along denominational lines. This has been particularly true with regard to the meetings of the theological commission. All speak as members of one church as though they have always belonged together. We are One Church and not merely a federation of churches.

A process of integration is also taking place, elements of value from the various traditions being gradually adopted by the whole Church. The principles of episcopacy, presbyterianism, and congregationalism, are all finding their place in the life of the Church. The Pastorate Committees have an important place in the administration of local congregations. Several dioceses have also begun to encourage the practice of regular church meetings with a view to developing more healthy and responsible local congregations. Congregationalism and episcopacy are now no longer mutually exclusive. The principles of universal value found in the different traditions redeem one another and the new Church is becoming richer than every single denomination.

2. *Discovery of the meaning of Episcopacy.* While sharing a certain pride in the congregationalist tradition I can confess with gratitude that the C.S.I. has helped me to see the meaning of episcopacy. Having had no direct experience of episcopacy I had assumed and even wished that the "historic episcopate in a constitutional form" would mean little more than the office of the Chairman of a Methodist Synod or the President of a Church Council of the S.I.U.C. The ideas of historic succession and lifetime bishops, and the necessity of episcopal ordinations, had not conveyed much meaning to me. But after being in the C.S.I. for some time, observing the working of episcopacy, I have gained certain insights into the nature of episcopacy which I could never have understood as a congregationalist. Whereas the Chairman or the President of the Church Council was primarily an administrative head of the Church, an office derived from the Western democratic patterns of society rather than from the N.T. conception of the Church, the Bishop is primarily a spiritual father of the diocese. In the C.S.I. the temporal administration of the diocese is largely in the hands of several committees. Even though the Bishop has to preside at most of these committees his primary responsibility is the pastoral care of the diocese, "doing all that he can to foster the true spiritual unity of the diocese", leadership in evangelism and preservation of true doctrine in the preaching and teaching of the Church. Whereas the Church Council President, being elected periodically, can represent the unity of the Church only in the impersonal character of his office, the Bishop can effectively represent the personal character of the Church's Unity. Even an ex-congregational Bishop in the C.S.I. speaks of himself as a father in God to his diocese and describes the members of his diocese as "my

flock" and "my children". Here is the clue to the relation between the grace of God in the office of the Bishop and the authority of the Church. Whatever interpretation may be given to the office and the consecration of Bishops, there is a growing recognition in the C.S.I. that Bishops are God's gift to the Church for her spiritual wellbeing. Naturally, it is becoming more and more widely accepted that confirmation should be done by Bishops.

3. *A Church "in via"*. The C.S.I. cannot be regarded merely as a combination of three or four different churches making a quantitatively larger church. It is to be understood as a dynamic movement looking for the Church which is according to the will of God revealed in Christ. The greatest danger it wants to avoid is that of becoming another denomination. What has happened in the C.S.I. is only the beginning of a process of union of all churches. It has been rightly described by Rev. A. M. Ward as the *Pilgrim Church*. The basis of union says that "in every effort to bring together divided members of Christ's body into one organization, the final aim must be the union in the Universal Church of all who acknowledge the Name of Christ, and that the test of all local schemes of union is that they should express locally the principle of the great catholic unity of the Body of Christ". The goal of union should be not a new denomination, but the manifestation of "the humanity reconstituted on earth". One important meaning of the Church is movement towards the unity which is the gift of God in Christ.

This sense of being a movement, of being a Church *in via*, was responsible for not attempting a neat and tidy union. The purpose of union is to enlarge the fellowship and not to limit it, and so the Church decided to maintain such relations of communion and fellowship with other churches as were severally maintained by the churches before their union in the C.S.I. This has created the anomaly of "the thirty year period", but the anomaly is derived from the disunity of the "parent churches" rather than from the C.S.I. and it will continue as long as churches remain disunited. The Ceylon and the North Indian schemes for union aim at a unified ministry from the beginning. But they do not really get over the theological problems created by the disunity of the Church. They rather reflect a desire to overcome the complex involvement in disunity by effecting a neat form of unified ministry. The C.S.I. takes both the unity and the disunity of the churches more seriously and patiently waits for the effects of the union upon the parent churches. The Church definitely intends to have a unified ministry, when every minister will have episcopal ordination. But the Church's attitude to other ministries will not entirely be determined by the desire to have a unified ministry. It will also be conditioned by fellowship with the parent churches. If the parent churches unite the problem for the C.S.I. will be less difficult.

Another expression of the sense of being a movement was the invitation to other Churches at the very first synod to enter into negotiations for a larger union. Conversations have been going on with the Lutherans for the last five years with a view to seeing if the two

churches agree in the basic doctrines. These conversations have helped both the churches to express some of the doctrines with greater clarity. At the meeting of the C.S.I. Theological Commission at Bangalore in June 1951 they discussed the indispensable elements for the visible unity of the Church and they framed a new "Quadrilateral" which may be described as the "Bangalore Quadrilateral", which I think is more comprehensive than the "Lambeth Quadrilateral". They said:

> Without implying that the following statement is adequate to the fullness of the Church we consider that these four elements are necessary in any agreement to come together in organic union.
>
> 1. *The Holy Scriptures* of the Old and New Testaments, accepted as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as the supreme and decisive standard of faith, and studied, read, expounded in language understood by the people. *Note.* We do not here refer to the ancient creeds, and the confessions of the Church, because they are subordinate to the authority of Scripture. We affirm, however, that fidelity to the Revelation in Scripture would preclude union with any church which could not accept the truths witnessed to in the Nicene Creed.
> 2. *The sacraments* of Baptism and the Lord's Supper duly administered.
> 3. *A ministry* carrying the greatest possible degree of authority and acceptance.
> 4. *A common life* in which is accepted the obligation to give to every member the opportunity of exercising the gifts given to each by the Holy Spirit, for building up the Body in holiness and truth, and for witness in the world.

Continued discussions between the C.S.I. and the Lutherans have made it possible to issue agreed statements on the Relation of Doctrinal and Confessional Statements to the Being of the Church, on the Law and the Gospel, and on the Doctrine of Election.

At the last meeting of the C.S.I.-Lutheran Joint Theological Commission, in March 1954, they said, "We record with gratitude that in our discussions so far we have not found any basic disagreement on essential Christian doctrines. We agree that we are at one in honestly seeking to know God's will as revealed in the Scriptures and to bring the life and teaching of the Church in conformity with it. We therefore affirm what we said in July 1953, that the measure of doctrinal agreement between us is such as to warrant a closer fellowship than now exists between our Churches".

There is a possibility that conversations with a view to organic union will soon start with the Mar Thoma Syrian Church. A Committee appointed by the Metropolitan of the Mar Thoma Church "to study and report on the question of the relationship to the C.S.I." has recommended that inter-communion be established between the C.S.I. and Mar Thoma Church and that "there is sufficient unity in Faith and Order between the C.S.I. and the Mar Thoma Church to proceed with the appointment of a Theological Committee to enter into talks with the Theological Committee of the C.S.I. with a view to explore the possibility of Union between the two Churches".

When the union with the Lutherans and the Mar Thoma Church takes place there will come into being a Church which brings to-

gether both the Lutheran and the Reformed traditions and also the Western and Eastern traditions. The desire for larger unity is only one of the marks of fresh vitality in the Church. The act of union in obedience to the will of God has opened the Church to a fuller working of the Holy Spirit and there is a longing in the Church for a richer experience of every aspect of the Church's fellowship.

4. *Worship of the Church.* I am particularly grateful for the enrichment of the worship of the Church. In the C.S.I. liturgy I have found certain depths of experience of the joy and hope in God which I have missed in some other forms of worship. It combines the orderliness and solemnity of set forms and the spontaneity of free church traditions. The incorporation of some of the characteristic elements of the Eastern Liturgies has made it more congenial to Indian Christian devotion. There is in the liturgy a blending of the catholic, orthodox and protestant emphases which contribute to the richness of the worship. It is quite in keeping with the spirit of "a church which has inherited Anglican catholicity, Methodist warmth, and the Reformers' emphasis on the sovereignty of God". Experiments are being made to set different parts of the Liturgy to Indian lyrical music. In the Dornakal Diocese the whole liturgy has been set to Telugu music. In the Tamil Nad Theological College, the congregational responses in the liturgy have been set to carnatic music, considerably improving the indigenous character of the worship. A suggestion has been made that Christian poets should be asked to render all the congregational responses into poetical form which can be sung, instead of the prose translation. When this suggestion is implemented we shall have forms of the liturgy which will be both genuinely Indian while being genuinely catholic or ecumenical in faith. The Liturgy Committee has just completed a lectionary for the whole year and a scheme of proper lessons and collects for every Sunday. When these are regularly used by the churches it will help the building up of the faith of the people. Besides the liturgy, many other orders of service are also used, namely, the orders for the ordination of deacons and presbyters and the order of confirmation service. An order for the service of Baptism is being drawn by the Liturgy Committee. The increasing use of set forms of worship may have the danger of introducing too much ceremonialism in worship. But there is a certain flexibility in these forms which gives a due place for the warmth of free prayer.

5. *The Ministry of the Church.* The ministry of the Church has been another growing point of the C.S.I. The threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons has been accepted by the C.S.I. But there is a growing feeling that the present pattern of a fully paid trained ministry is not altogether suitable for the rural church in India. The Church is not able to provide adequate man-power to fulfil the ministerial needs of all congregations. The Synod Committee on Deacons in its report presented to the Third Synod pointed out that "the present system destroys the character of the local congregation as a real spiritual unit responsible under God for the ordering of its own life. It places the burden of regular preaching

on men who are, for the most part, not trained for it. It removes the sacraments from the centre of congregational life to the position of occasional ministrations provided by a visitor from outside. It places the major part of pastoral responsibility on a group of men not ordained to the pastoral ministry". In order to meet this situation the Fourth Synod has given permission to the dioceses to choose local honorary presbyters for village congregations, waiving in such cases the existing rules about qualifications. They should be men who have proved themselves men of prayer and evangelistic zeal, who have been engaged in voluntary service in the village. They should also receive some training for the work of the presbyter. But their qualifications and abilities will not be of the same kind as those of the present theologically trained presbyters. At present such presbyters are to be chosen on an experimental basis. The situation will be reviewed after four years. The need for this experiment is recognized in almost every diocese, and if it becomes a regular practice the Church will have to define the relation between the well-trained full-time presbyters and the honorary village presbyters. Should the trained presbyters be recognized as a separate order primarily for the ministry of preaching and teaching? The experiments may lead to new insights about the nature of the ministry. The nature of the diaconate has become the subject of even more radical thinking. At present the C.S.I. diaconate shares the ambiguity which exists in the catholic tradition. The C.S.I. desires to make the diaconate a distinctive order fulfilling an essential function of the Church. The Synod Ministerial Committee has suggested the acceptance of "an *order of Servants* distinct from the episcopate and the presbyterate, primarily to include those who render service to the Church in a voluntary capacity". The question has been referred to the Theological Commission for further study of the nature and function of the diaconate. Should not the diaconate be reconstituted as an order representing the Church's works of charity and social concern? Here is an area of concern not only for the Church in India but for the Church throughout the world. An adequate answer can be sought only as the Church seeks to fulfil its mission in the world in obedience to the Lord.

Developments in the C.S.I. have already shown that the ministry of the Church is not limited to the ordained ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons. The inauguration of the Order of Women in 1952 is a recognition of the special ministry of women in the Church called to life-long Christian service. About forty keen women in full-time Christian work have joined this Order. They follow a Rule of Life and earnestly pray regularly for the spiritual awakening of the Church. Besides binding all women workers into a warm and mutually strengthening fellowship, the Sisterhood Order helps the Church to call many Indian Christian women for full-time Christian service.

To complete the picture of the expansion of the ministry I should refer to developments in the ministry of the laity. "The re-discovery of the layman" is not peculiar to the C.S.I. But the enthusiasm with which the Church has received the movement is a mark of the

Church's vitality. Mr R. D. Paul, the Secretary of the Synod, in his report to the Fourth Synod speaks of the need for a deeper and more widespread interest in the laity, but he also reports much advance in the recognition of the place of the laity in the Church. The Church has realized that its manifold ministry, including instruction and pastoral care of members, evangelism and social service, cannot be fulfilled without the laity. Every diocese without exception has begun to train a large body of volunteers of different types to meet different needs. Some dioceses have adopted schemes for the licensing and commissioning of voluntary workers. The Synod Executive Committee has recently appointed a person to be responsible for organizing programs for laymen throughout South India. While regarding the ordained ministry as a gift of God, the Church is becoming increasingly aware of the significance of "the priesthood of all believers". The idea that every member of the congregation, whatever be his earthly occupation, has a responsibility in the total Christian witness of the congregation is gradually gaining strength.

6. *Indigenization.* Another important growing point is the indigenous character of the Church. The leadership of the Church has so far been predominantly western. Missionaries have played comparatively a much larger role than Indians in the Church Union negotiations, in the theological commissions, in the shaping of the liturgy and in many other aspects of the Church's life. Westerners continue to play a leading part in the life and thought of the Church. Much of the work in the Church still depends on funds from abroad. We can never forget the fact that the Church of South India is the fruit of the labours of foreign missionaries from the west. But Church Union has accentuated the desire for making the Church really indigenous with greater indigenization of leadership as well as support. The question of Indian leadership was opened for serious discussion at the Third Synod and methods of developing more adequate Indian leadership and changing the present pattern of Church-Mission relationships so as to make the Church take deeper roots in the Indian soil are still under consideration. At the Fourth Synod the question of the extent to which the C.S.I. should continue to be financially dependent on the West and the right use of missionary personnel were considered. The tendency in these discussions is not that the C.S.I. should become entirely independent of the Churches in the West. The Church does not ask for the withdrawal of missionaries from India. Growth in the indigenous character is rather understood in terms of growth in local responsibility both for the support of the Church's program and for the life and thought of the Church. The basis of union says that "the uniting churches trust that the united church, conserving all that is of spiritual value in its Indian heritage, will express under Indian conditions and in Indian form the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal". For the fulfilment of this hope the Church has yet to go a long way. But with more freedom and greater sense of responsibility Indian leadership will be used by God to shape a Church that will present Christ to India with greater relevance.

Conclusion. What I have said so far is not meant to create the impression that Church Union has put everything right in South India. It has not put everything right. The act of union has also been accompanied by disruption of fellowship at certain points marked by the problems created by the "continuing Anglicans" and the "continuing Congregationalists". In some places the continuance of non-uniting groups has led to the scandal of lawsuits before non-Christian judges. We have also the ugly phenomenon in one or two places of beautiful places of worship being closed because the contending parties cannot come together in peace. But these ugly incidents cannot be described as fruits of the Union. They are rather the exposures of "what is in man". In almost every single case the grounds of difference are non-theological, arising out of the lack of the love of Christ rather than the zeal for Christ.

But what is more significant than the disruption of fellowship is the growth in fellowship in the Church as a whole. If, as Augustine said, the bonds of Christian unity are faith and love, the experience of the C.S.I. has shown that obedience to unity in Christ also leads to the increase of faith and love. There is in the Church a certain spirit of unity which is an evidence of the work of the Holy Spirit helping to overcome the forces that hinder fellowship.

Looking at the C.S.I. from the point of view of settled ideas of Catholicity and Apostolicity, some of the older churches may see anomalies. But, as Bishop Rawlinson has pointed out in *Problems of Re-union*, "In a divided Christendom no one Church holds in completeness of undistorted synthesis the balanced wholeness of catholicity and truth . . . the way back to recovered fullness of catholicity is through reunion rather than vice versa." Ideas of Catholicity and Apostolicity, instead of being applied to test United churches, should be re-learnt from the experience of United churches and applied to judge the older churches standing in isolation. The C.S.I. does not accept a static conception of the Church. It is a Church living in hope, waiting for the full manifestation and realization of the Church which is yet to be when we see Christ as he is. Till then the Church grows in the knowledge and the experience of Christ who is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever. The Church's task, therefore, is not simply to maintain a static order which came into being at a particular period in history, but in the power of the Holy Spirit to grow into fuller knowledge of her salvation and to manifest that knowledge in her life and witness.

J. R. CHANDRAN.

"I Believe in the C.S.I."—Reflections of an Ex-Anglican

Is the C.S.I. truly Indian? One of the most penetrating criticisms of the C.S.I. Scheme came from the Editorial columns of THEOLOGY,[1] which characterized the Scheme as "a high-minded amalgam of

[1] April 1943, p. 74.

Anglican, Methodist, Congregational, and Presbyterian elements, but not really a true Indian expression of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church". To admit this is not to belittle the C.S.I., but to point to the "heritage"—good and bad—that was handed down to it from the parent Churches of the West, and to express the hope that indigenous leadership and indigenous Christian theology are far more likely to blossom in a united Church, however imperfect.

It is, of course, essential that the C.S.I. should be related to the soil if it is to survive, but far more essential, even, is it that it should be rooted in Christ and keep in close touch with the Universal Church, if it is not to become so national as to be less than Christian, for, in an independent India, with a secular Constitution indeed but nevertheless with a non-Christian majority in power, only a strong, united Church, which is both truly native and truly Catholic, can resist the ever-increasing pressure of syncretism, the danger of being ideologically absorbed into the major faith, as has happened to predecessors like Buddhism and Jainism.

The "Catholic" Idea of the Local Church. The C.S.I. challenges the very concept of denomination, for this Church is in the nature of an attempt to return to the N.T. conception of the Church as the whole body of Christians—worshipping and witnessing—in a particular locality. During recent centuries, we have become so accustomed to different denominations calling themselves "Churches" in a non-N.T. sense and functioning side by side, that we have ceased to regard the phenomenon as being abnormal.

The various missionary bodies working in India had agreed, as a practical necessity forced on them by pastoral or evangelistic exigencies, on the principle of Comity of Missionary expansion, and thus in effect had unconsciously reasserted the N.T. idea of the local Church as an embodiment of the Universal Church. But as the post-Reformation Church, unlike the N.T. Church, was divided into denominations, the Concordat virtually made a man's denomination a matter of geography rather than of theology. The Comity of Missions was increasingly stultified and rendered foolish, when Christians of one tradition moved from one area to another where the tradition was different. The problem, therefore, was either to disregard the Comity of Missions and to allow all denominations to work everywhere, side by side (if not in virtual rivalry), or to go back to the N.T. and *Catholic* idea. The C.S.I. represents an endeavour to do the latter.

Catholic Witness? The doubt is frequently expressed whether Catholic witness would survive in the C.S.I. Frankly, "Catholicism" has never been very pronounced in South India. Thus while the C.M.S. in the old days was definitely Evangelical, the S.P.G. here has been mostly non-committal in churchmanship, the difference, to the average churchman, being often one of little more than crosses, lights and coloured stoles; sacramental confession, for instance, was almost unheard-of. Bengal had its Oxford Mission Fathers and its Sisterhood of the Epiphany; Delhi had its Cambridge Brotherhood, and Bombay its Cowley Fathers, but in South India, with its more

populous and advanced Christian community, what, in this respect, did our dear Mother, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, do for us? It is surely unrealistic to expect the C.S.I. to be more Catholic than the Anglican Communion in South India ever was! *J'accuse!*

But the survival of Catholic witness in the C.S.I., as far as it goes, will depend partly on external, and partly on internal, factors. By "external factors" I mean the readiness of the Anglican Church to co-operate with us, among other things, by helping in the establishment of Religious Orders for men and women. (The command to love one's neighbour surely includes the obligation to love the C.S.I.!) By "internal factors" I mean that ex-Anglicans will and can keep what they want to keep, and this will depend not so much on non-Anglican influence or pressure but on the foundations which had already been laid prior to union.

It is facilely assumed that the C.S.I. should be not merely more Anglican but also more Anglo-Catholic. But, indeed, why *Anglo*-Catholic? After all, the Indian genius has more in common with the Latin genius than with the "Nordic" one, and if ever the C.S.I. should decide to go the whole Catholic way, it would surely be more in the fitness of things that she should line up with a really international body like the Church of Rome—the Catholic Church *par excellence*, as the late Dr Inge described it, rightly or wrongly—than with the Church of the British people and—in origin at least—of the British Empire, of which the Republic of India is no longer a part! Even the Anglican Church is not a Dominical foundation or of universal necessity!

A Catholic Liturgy. The C.S.I. Liturgy is the only Sunday morning Service provided, the whole congregation being expected to stay throughout, the communicant members communicating. It is a Ministry both of the Word (including O.T. Lection, Psalm, Epistle, and Gospel) and of the Sacrament, although the phrases "Little Entrance" (when the Bible is brought in) and "Great Entrance" (when the Elements are brought in) are not specifically used. The Basilican posture is recommended for the celebrant, as far as possible. There is no "moment of consecration" such as there is in the Western liturgies or climax such as the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eastern liturgies; the Communion may be regarded as the climax, if climax there must be.

The whole Service is an attempt to recover the corporate character of the primitive Eucharist. It is also a comprehensive Service in that it has borrowed from the Syrian Qurbana, the Roman Mass, the second-century Didache, the Mozarabic Rite of early Spain, the Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, and the customs common among the "people called Methodists"—among other sources. The provision for silence is a noteworthy feature. "The restoration through the use of silence of a mystical quality to the Services of the Reformed Churches would be of a permanent value, enriching and energizing the spiritual life of the Christian community."[1]

[1] Maxwell, *Concerning Worship*, pp. 13–14.

If even such an innocuous phrase as the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" is excluded, it is because there is still some controversy regarding the meaning of "sacrifice". But the idea of sacrifice is emphasized at three points at least, namely, (i) In the Offertory; (ii) In the Great Thanksgiving; and (iii) In the Post-Communion Prayer. The following note on "sacrifice" to be found in a book published by the Diocese of Madras in 1950 is illuminating.[1]

> "To *sacrifice* means 'to make sacred', to offer to God. And it is obvious that on the Bible view of life there is only one thing that man can sacrifice, that is his own freedom, his heart and mind and will. Everything else in the world already belongs wholly to God; but God in his grace has given man in a sense or in a measure the divine gift of freedom. We cannot offer to God to make sacred anything but that, and, if we speak of bringing gifts to him, we speak symbolically: the 'gifts' are tokens that we seek to offer ourselves. But it is the universal Christian experience that no man is either worthy or able to offer himself to God, if he is thinking of himself in isolation and selfishly. It is only because Jesus has made, on behalf of mankind, a perfect sacrifice, by offering to God a human will wholly made sacred that the rest of us can make that sacrifice at all; and we can make it, not as individuals, but only as members of the Church, the 'Body of Christ'—the visible Church with its continuous body of doctrine, its ministry, its divinely appointed sacraments."

The emergence of the C.S.I. Liturgy, with the general approval of Liturgical authorities, Catholic and Evangelical, is no mean achievement in a sphere where theological and non-theological factors alike are powerfully at work. A C.S.I. authority of Anglican tradition claims: "None who has taken part at all regularly in the C.S.I. Liturgy can doubt that something fresh has come in for us all. Every time I go back to one of the old forms, I am conscious of the drop in a corporate sense."

Orders for Women and Men. (i) An Order for Women was inaugurated on Whitsunday 1952, "in order to provide one means whereby the Church may recognize the ministry of such women who are engaged in full-time service of the Church and who, regarding their service as part of a life-long vocation, desire to accept the obligations and discipline of such an order in fellowship with other women"; their work is "the furtherance of the Gospel whether by means of pastoral, educational, medical, or social ministries". They have a simple rule of life. At the moment, there are some fifty Sisters, the majority being nationals, living in six Houses.

Fr Dalby, S.S.J.E., writes in the *Cowley Evangelist*:

> "I called at the House of the new C.S.I. Sisterhood—mostly Indian. It is a loosely-knit affair, very well adapted to Indian conditions. They have a very suitable and simple costume of a white *sari* with mauve border; and I think we might learn much from the dignity and extreme simplicity of the externals and the setting of their life . . . To Nandikotkurto to see another branch there of the Sisterhood, two English women and some Indian ones living happily together on Franciscan lines in the same dignified simplicity I observed at Bangalore."

(ii) At the third Synod held in 1952, the following recommendation

[1] *Ways of Worship*, pp. 68–9.

from its Ministerial Committee was endorsed: *"The development of a Brotherhood of Men who have accepted a vocation as to celibate Ministry would be a source of strength to the Church."*

The Catholic leaven is thus at work in the C.S.I., and those of us who were Anglicans would say to our Mother Church: *"Send us a few strong men, as Catholic as you can get, and as quickly as you can."*

The Doctrine of the Church. If the C.S.I. has not yet formulated a full doctrine of the Church, it is not an omission due solely to oversight, but partly of set purpose, for, in the divided state of Christendom, and in a newly united Church, such a doctrine can only be *evolved*, not *invented* afresh. This process of evolution must necessarily be gradual. We do not know where it will lead. In the words of the Moderator at the second Synod in 1950: "The demand to know where we are going is one which no Christian has the right to make." But such a full doctrine of the Church may well stand a fairer chance of formulation in a united Church. There is *some* hope, in a new, united, missionary Church, of separating what is essential from what is not, whereas in denominational existence the emphasis is more likely to be on the differences and, therefore, one sided.

Bishop Neill, referring to the fact that "even the Church of Rome, which has defined most things, has left here a wide gap for further theological exploration", observes:

> "If no one Christian communion has yet worked out a precise and satisfactory theology of the Church—its nature and its limits, the relationship between the visible and the invisible, the sense in which the Church is the Body of Christ its Head—it may be that, in the new fellowships which are coming into being in the twentieth century, new light and understanding may be given, through fellowship, and through the new tensions that life in fellowship brings."[1]

The Moderator, speaking on behalf of the C.S.I., writes:

> "Many problems of the Conference Hall that seemed almost insoluble when we faced each other from outside with an obligation to defend the separate denominational emphases, have taken on a very different appearance when we find ourselves handling them as practical issues within the fellowship of one Church."[2]

The Ministry. There has been some controversy in Anglican circles over C.S.I. Orders. What, one ventures to think, both the C.S.I. and the Anglican Church could do with is a clearer doctrine of the *Church* as a whole, and it is a matter for regret that the last Lambeth Report failed to devote a section to the Church. The emergence of the C.S.I., therefore, and the controversy that has ensued on its Orders is a challenge to all of us to set our doctrinal houses in order. Unfortunately, emphasis in the past tended to be too exclusively on the preservation of the Succession, without reference to the Church as a whole. The notion was too long encouraged that the

[1] Neill, *Christian Partnership*, p. 90.
[2] Hollis, *The Nature of the Church*, Faith and Order Report, p. 225.

only thing that mattered was the link with the historic episcopate. One cannot help thinking that some harm has been done in separating Faith from Order. The C.S.I. will, therefore, have aided the cause of ecumenical unity, if it drives Christians all over the world to re-think the whole doctrine of the Church, and of the Ministry as a part thereof.

(It may be mentioned, in passing, that more than half of the clergy of the C.S.I. to-day, not seven years after Union, are episcopally ordained, and almost the only non-episcopally ordained ministers at the end of the thirty-year period are likely to be missionaries who even to-day form only five per cent.; with increasing restrictions by the State, they may be even less, and in any case Missionary Societies are being asked to send out their recruits unordained, so that they may receive episcopal ordination in India.)

The Ordinal used for the Consecration of our Bishops (as of Ordinations) is similar to that of the Church of England, and there can be no question of our "intention and expectation" or of the "form and manner". Our Bishops *are* in the Historic Succession. If a Bishop of the C.S.I., as an ex-Methodist Missionary wittily puts it, is not altogether "a new creation, he is undoubtedly a revised version, freed from ancient corruptions and misinterpretations, but not without authority, a simple and sincere modern rendering of ancient truths, admirably adapted to the democratic spirit of the age"! Dr Oliver Tomkins, after a tour of South India, wrote: "I can imagine many an English Bishop wishing that these essential lines of his office were as clearly etched as they are . . . in the developing episcopate of the C.S.I." And Fr Dalby testified in his Community's paper: "One thing I give the C.S.I. absolutely full marks for every time is that they really do show what episcopacy is. Their Bishops are leaders and centres of unity and peace for Christian bodies of different traditions. They are not public functionaries living in pretentious style." And again, in the News Sheet of the C.S.I. Council in Great Britain: "I was deeply impressed by the Apostolic dignity and simplicity of the four Bishops whom I actually met, and this impression is, I gather, entirely endorsed by those who have had far more opportunity for inside observation and on a wider scale than my all too brief visit allowed. Certainly, the C.S.I. Bishop is a real centre of unity for the faithful within his own Diocese, drawing together in a wonderful way the Christians of varying traditions that have come into the C.S.I., and this is one most important function of the Historic Episcopate, binding together the Church on earth into one visible body."

Unlike the Tractarians,who emphasized the theory of the Apostolic Succession, but failed in their attempt to restore the second-century episcopate to England, the C.S.I., which began with no more definite theory than the Church of England, but only the fact of the Historic Episcopate, seems to be reproducing the second-century episcopate in South India. In other words, there is being hammered out in South India a pattern of episcopacy, not perhaps entirely new in the history of the Church, but largely forgotten since the early centuries.

In the words of the ex-Anglican Lay Secretary of the Synod:

> "There was every danger of our perpetuating the old Anglo-Indian type of Bishops who were spiritual overlords, with the emphasis on the latter word. There was also the danger of our evolving a type of Bishop who would be no more than a glorified superintending missionary—chief official and Executive Head of the Diocese—but as things have actually worked out, our Bishops have begun to play a part in the life of the Church which corresponds more truly to the original Apostolic pattern of spiritual eminence. They are rapidly coming to be thought of as chief pastors of the flock, fathers-in-God of the whole congregation in the diocese, visible embodiments of an authority derived from something much wider than the local Church and much higher than the Diocesan Council which elected them can give."

It was a matter of deep regret to us that, while "Lambeth 1930" foresaw "anomalies and irregularities", yet expressed the hope that "its Bishops would be received as Bishops", Convocations postponed decision about C.S.I. Orders. In this respect, there seem to have been frequent changes of ground. From 1888 onwards, the emphasis, as mentioned above, was merely on the historic episcopate, but although the C.S.I. *is* episcopal, its Ordinal unexceptionable, "form and manner" above reproach, the Succession intact, and its credal Orthodoxy fully satisfactory, a new argument was then brought forward, namely, that "valid Orders do not make a valid Church; only a valid Church can convey valid Orders"—whatever the criterion of "validity"! The latest argument goes further and speaks in terms of an exclusive episcopal jurisdiction—an attitude which would unchurch considerable sections of the Anglican Communion istelf.

When our ex-Methodist or ex-Presbyterian or ex-Congregationalist brethren ask for the views of their respective parent bodies, they receive clear-cut answers, but we, ex-Anglicans, are confronted with "majority" and "minority" resolutions, and with successive postponements of vital decisions! "How long, O Lord"!

The Syrian Churches and C.S.I. Union seems to be within sight with the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, a Reformed body. A Committee appointed by this Church has found that there is no reason why there should not be immediate intercommunion between the two Churches and has suggested the appointment of a Committee of Theologians to meet with the theologians of the C.S.I. to discuss corporate union. This is the only Eastern Church that is both Ancient and Reformed, retaining the Historic Succession of the episcopate, but with its Liturgy in the mother-tongue. It may be said to occupy, among the Eastern Churches, a bridge position somewhat similar to that which the Anglican Church once occupied. (I say "once occupied" because there is a tendency in some quarters, in the Anglican Church, to convert the bridge into an impassable fortress!)

In connexion with both the Mar Thoma and the Jacobite Syrian Churches, it is significant that, having for centuries observed Christmas on our Epiphany Day, they have since 1952 and 1953 respectively changed over to the Western date. The "Union spirit" is not static!

If union with a separated Eastern Church is a possibility, is full inter-communion with our Mother Church (I speak as an ex-

Anglican or "Anglican plus") an impossibility? We believe that it is both a practical necessity and a theological possibility.

Mission and Unity. In conclusion, it may be stated that Church Union was first conceived in 1919 at Tranquebar because certain national Christian leaders were convinced that a divided Church could never be an effective evangelistic agency in India. So to-day, too, it is hardly likely that:

> "a resolute dealing with our divisions will come except in the context of a quite new acceptance on the part of all Churches of the obligation to bring the Gospel to every creature; nor do I think that the world will believe that Gospel until it sees more evidence of its power to make us one. These two tasks—mission and unity—must be prosecuted together and in indissoluble relation one with another. . . . The unity of the Church will not distil out of a process of purely theological discussion."[1]

DAVID CHELLAPPA.

Bangalore Brotherhood of St Peter and the C.S.I.

TOWARDS the end of the year 1906 the Bishop Cotton Schools in Bangalore, South India, were in very low water and Bishop Whitehead of Madras, the Chairman of their Board of Governors, invited Herbert Pakenham Walsh (afterwards the first Bishop in Assam) and his small Brotherhood to come up from Bishop Heber College in Trichinopoly and try to counteract the ebbing fortunes of the schools. They came in 1907 and the Brotherhood of St Peter, as it is now called, has been in charge of the boys' school ever since and one of its members is usually chaplain of the girls' school. Since the arrival of the Brotherhood the schools have grown considerably in numbers and become renowned throughout India—and indeed their old students are to be found in all parts of the Commonwealth. The members of the Brotherhood live a corporate life of Eucharist, prayer, intercession, meditation, celibacy, and simplicity, giving the main part of their income to the Common Fund. Their work and responsibilities have increased in the course of years. In addition to their work in the boys' school they now have charge of St Mark's Cathedral, Bangalore, the cathedral church of the new Diocese of Mysore, oversight of the Cathedral School—an orphanage for Anglo-Indian boys and girls, and charge of St Matthew's Railway Church in Bangalore City. Their ecclesiastical outlook is Catholic, with plenty of "Anglo" in it; and so if I write about the Brotherhood's reaction to the Church of South India, it will be realized how at any rate one small body of Anglo-Catholics views it and life therein.

In the first place it may well be asked why we took such a perilous step, from a strictly orthodox point of view, as to throw in our lot at all with the C.S.I. The answer to that one is:

First, because the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, that part of the Anglican Communion to which we belonged, by a majority in each House voting separately, the House of

[1] Newbigin, *The Household of God*, pp. 151–2.

Bishops, the House of Clergy, and the House of Laity, brought the Church of South India into existence. And the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon was, and is, the highest ecclesiastical authority in that Church. In becoming part of the C.S.I. we were therefore acting in obedience to our highest ecclesiastical authority. If it was wrong to allow the C.S.I. to come into existence the blame must lie with the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon; and with each House of that Council—Bishops, Clergy, Laity.

Secondly, we threw in our lot with the new Church of South India because the Lambeth Conference of 1930 had decided that this experiment in reunion was an experiment which ought to be made; and the Continuation Committee of that Conference, whose advice was repeatedly asked, never went back on that decision. And the Lambeth Conference, composed as it is of Bishops from all parts of the Anglican Communion, is the nearest expression of the mind of the whole Anglican Communion that there is. If this experiment in reunion ought not to have been made, then the Bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled at Lambeth ought to have said quite clearly that it should not be made. Or at any rate the Lambeth Continuation Committee should have called a halt to this movement for reunion until the meeting of the next Lambeth Conference.

Thirdly, if we had stood outside this experiment in union which our local Church and the whole Anglican Communion (in so far as its corporate mind was expressed at Lambeth) had sanctioned, we should have been creating one more little pocket of schism within the Church of South India (such as have caused so much scandal and grief to the Church in Nandyal and elsewhere) and so have been active in undermining this experiment in reunion from the very start.

Fourthly, although we priests and missionaries who did not like it might be able to retire from the area of the Church of South India and find work elsewhere, the people to whom we had ministered would not be able so to retire; for their homes and their work were here; and here they would have to stay. Were Anglican priests to desert their people and their work and their many fine institutions, and leave the Pledge (which said that ex-Anglicans should have an episcopally ordained ministry to minister to them) to be without effect? Yes, certainly, if the Anglican Communion had forbidden this experiment. But surely the answer was "No", since it was an experiment which the Anglican Communion had blessed and permitted to be made. Moreover the Church of South India had been brought into existence by the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, to which we all belonged.

Fifthly, if all Catholic-minded priests and missionaries fled incontinently from the Church of South India, how were Catholic faith and practice to be upheld in that Church? Did we not owe it to the very principles we had at heart to stay where we were? There has been a proposal to send Catholic-minded priests from England to South India to strengthen and uphold Catholic tradition in the new Church, without their throwing in their lot with the C.S.I. How will

these Catholic-minded priests and missionaries make their communion? Will their sacraments be valid if they are under no jurisdiction? And what Bishop will confirm their candidates for Confirmation? And into what part of the Church will they shepherd the people who are influenced by them? Surely the whole idea is impracticable. The only sane method is for Catholic-minded priests and missionaries to throw in their lot with the C.S.I.—as indeed the bulk of the Anglican Communion has wisely allowed us to do, without in any way implying that by so doing we are being tainted with the sin of schism.

Having—with much trepidation, it must be admitted—taken this perilous step, what has been our experience? A warm welcome and a generous appreciation of the special contribution which we have to make to the C.S.I. on the part of our ex-Methodist, ex-Congregational, and ex-Presbyterian brethren. One of the first things which happened to us was that, in a predominantly ex-Methodist diocese, we were given charge of our new Cathedral Church. And there we have our daily round of Mattins, Eucharist, and Evensong. We have always been accustomed to wear the eucharistic vestments and to have servers in alb and amice; and no kind of difficulty has been placed in our way. Indeed this is what St Mark's for many years now has been used to. Our chief service on Sunday mornings is a Sung Eucharist at 8 a.m. with some 120 to 150 communicants every Sunday. This is followed at 9.30 a.m. by a plain celebration of Holy Communion for older and infirm people. And at 10.15 a.m. there is a celebration of Holy Communion in Malayalam (the language of Travancoreans) with hymns. We minister also to a Telugu congregation (mostly remaining Anglicans from Nandyal who are working in Bangalore) and they have their Sung Eucharist in St Peter's Chapel in the school. We reserve the Blessed Sacrament by intinction for the sick and have a large number of sick people to whom we take Communion. We still hear confessions, as we always have done, whenever occasion arises. And we have our annual Three Days' Retreat to which several of our ex-nonconformist clergy also come. Twice a week we use with increasing appreciation the Liturgy of the Church of South India. But on a Sunday we at present use it only on the fifth Sunday in the month, with Deacon and Sub-Deacon in dalmatic and tunicle. Doubtless ultimately we shall come to use it more frequently on Sundays; but we minister to a congregation which is largely ex-Anglican; and although our congregation is much more progressive than many, Anglican congregations have a tendency to be averse from change. We have found that some of our ex-nonconformist friends greatly appreciate our daily Eucharist and often come to join their worship with us. On festal occasions and for Confirmations our Bishop, an ex-Methodist, wears the Cathedral cope and mitre; and he wears the Cathedral vestments when he comes to celebrate for us during the week. And one of the early things that he did after his consecration was to come to the Cathedral clergy and ask to be shown how to celebrate Holy Communion in the same way that we do.

Confirmation is administered with great dignity by our Bishop; and in view of what the late Bishop Azariah of Dornakal prophesied before Union, it is interesting to note that it is becoming the rule, with but few exceptions, that Confirmation shall be taken by the Bishop. The C.S.I. Confirmation service seems to us to be much more effective than the Anglican rite because it makes clear to the candidates what are their main duties as grown-up members of the Church, lets candidates hear read the accounts of both of the Laying-on of Hands recorded in the Acts, and has a welcome at the end of the service of the candidates on the part of the congregation to make them realize that they really are expected to share in the grown-up life and duties of the congregation. At the same time the central acts of prayer for the coming of the Holy Spirit and the Laying-on of Hands are as strongly emphasized as they are in the Anglican rite—indeed in the actual Confirmation the Anglican rite is retained in its entirety.

What about the observance of the "Pledge", as it is called—the promise made in the Constitution that no ex-Anglican congregation should have forced upon it the ministrations of a non-episcopally ordained minister against the will of its members? So far as we have been able to see, this has been most scrupulously observed. Where there have been exceptions those exceptions have been made at the request of the congregations concerned. And these requests have been due to the absence of ex-Anglican priests who could minister to ex-Anglican congregations in outlying towns and villages; and these congregations either have to have no celebration of Holy Communion from one year's end to another or else ask for the ministration of the ex-Methodist, ex-Congregationalist, or ex-Presbyterian minister in the neighbourhood. The blame for this must rest to some large extent on those people in the Anglican Church who have tried to make it as difficult as possible for loyal Anglican priests to remain in South India. The position is gradually righting itself as more and more candidates for the ministry are episcopally ordained; and of course every new candidate for the ministry is episcopally ordained.

One thing we find especially distressing, namely, that from the hands of some of our new-found brethren we cannot receive the Holy Communion,, owing to the fact that they are not episcopally ordained. There is a theory current that the commissioning by the Bishop which took place at the inauguration of Union (and which takes place in the case of every new minister who comes from outside to minister in the C.S.I.) conferred upon non-episcopally ordained ministers the special grace of episcopal ordination. But we have not found it possible to accept that view of the matter. Our point of view is that the whole case for episcopal ordination is given away if we accept that theory. So there are some of our brethren whom we cannot ask to celebrate the Holy Communion in our ex-Anglican churches; and when they celebrate in their own churches, although we attend the service, we do not receive communion. They do not like the situation; neither do we. But they are kind and good in respecting our consciences in the matter, even although they do not under-

stand or sympathize with our point of view. From our experience in this regard we would urge upon the supporters of new schemes of Union to devise some means of unifying the ministry of the united Church from the very start, as indeed they are doing in the Ceylon scheme and in that of North India. But it must be remembered in our own case that as more and more presbyters are ordained in the C.S.I., where every ordination must be an episcopal ordination, and as older ministers die or retire and are replaced by the episcopally ordained, the situation will automatically right itself.

There are anomalies in the C.S.I. from an Anglican point of view: Episcopally ordained and non-episcopally ordained ministers exist in the same Church and are working side by side. Some of the original Bishops and even some of the more recently consecrated Bishops have been consecrated *per saltum*, i.e. without having first received episcopal ordination as presbyters, even without having been confirmed (but it is not true that laymen have been made Bishops, still less true that there is any possibility of an unbaptized person being raised to the episcopate); Confirmation is administered by presbyters as well as by Bishops. These anomalies and others like them will come to an end in due course of their own accord. A good tonic for the shock caused to pious Anglican consciences by these anomalies is the study of post-reformation history of the English Church, more especially some of the vagaries of Commonwealth and Georgian and early Victorian times. But there is one anomaly which most probably will not come to an end for some long time: The Church of South India is in communion with bodies with which the Anglican Church is not in communion; and it probably will not cease being in communion with them. But it has to be remembered that it would have been impossible to ask our ex-Methodist, ex-Congregational, and ex-Presbyterian brethren to break their connexion with their Mother Churches in order to come into the union; also it must not be forgotten that the ideal towards which the C.S.I. is working is not union merely in South India, but union throughout the world; and this particular anomaly has to be judged in the light of the ultimate aim. Anomalies are inevitable in any scheme for the reunion of Churches of different traditions in some of which there is no episcopal ministry. There would have been no anomalies if all our Methodist brethren and all our Congregational brethren and all our Presbyterian brethren had decided to become good Anglicans; but that would not have been union; it would have been absorption. And it certainly was not practical politics at the time of Union. If we had waited until it was, we should have waited a very long time.

The question of the validity of our Ordinations in the C.S.I. exercises the minds of some people. Do we really intend to make Bishops and Priests or Presbyters such as they were understood from the time of the Early Church and such as the Anglican Communion in its formularies intends to make them? Well, our first Bishops were consecrated by three validly consecrated Bishops; and before they were consecrated the Form of Consecration was submitted to the Continuation Committee of the Lambeth Conference,

who passed it on to a special panel of theologians, who found that it was entirely adequate. The same was done with our Ordinal, with the same result—it was found entirely adequate. And one thing must surely be quite obvious—the fact that in accepting an episcopally ordained ministry our Nonconformist brethren had the desire of satisfying Anglican consciences; and that their intention in making Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons is to make such Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons as will satisfy Anglican consciences; and that without that intention there was no point at all in their accepting an episcopally ordained ministry.

Whether we like it or not the C.S.I. is in existence and it contains within it very large numbers of ex-Anglicans. Is the Anglican Church going to leave this large number of its own people unshepherded? We think that the majority decision at Lambeth 1948 and in the Convocations of Canterbury and York was generous towards us ex-Anglicans. We realize that because of its anomalies the C.S.I. cannot at the present time be in full communion with the Anglican Communion, and we are grateful that our place as individuals, both clergy and laity, in the Church of our upbringing has been safeguarded for us. To the more sticky minority we would say: Do you desire that the many ex-Anglicans in the C.S.I. shall lapse from their loyalty to those beliefs and practices for which the Anglican tradition stands? If you do not, then you must give people like us your sympathy, your help, and your prayers. We are trying to carry out a difficult task—and one which sometimes goes against the grain. Is it a task which you really wish should be left undone?

W. Elphick.

Thoughts on Returning to South India

By the time this will be read I shall be back in India—"home", as my small son calls it. I have been away a whole year and it is inevitable that my thoughts should be coloured by my experiences in England. Much has happened while I have been away. The first Indian Moderator has been elected, H. Sumitra, an ex-Congregationalist, associated with Union negotiations since 1920 and a former member of the United Theological College. The first representative of a Continental Reformed Church has been consecrated as Bishop of North Kerala, and in Travancore the Communists have increased their power as the result of an election. Yes, much has happened and more will happen because the Church is a Pilgrim Church, not thinking to have achieved, but only to have begun, *in via*, and the "unchanging East" is changing rapidly.

I have had much kindness shown to me in England and have seen much of church life, but how different it is! People who listened to what I had to say about Church Union in India with real enthusiasm could see no way of moving out of the impasse of church relations in England. I remember a visit to an ancient and beautiful parish church; immediately opposite it—a few yards away—was a

Methodist church. There is a background of bad history, old feuds, social differences, most difficult to forget and impossible to ignore. The situation is very different in India. I have been asked, "How do Anglicans get on with Nonconformists in India?" and I am bound to reply, "What Nonconformists? To whom do they 'nonconform', from whom do they dissent?" In a sense *all* Christians are nonconformists—to Hinduism. Similarly, when asked how Anglicans get on with free churchmen, I am bound to reply, "But Anglicans, since the passing of the 'Indian Church Measure', *are* free churchmen, with no State connexion, free to reform their liturgy or to elect their own bishops."

It is impossible to understand what has happened in South India without some knowledge of the Comity of Missions, which reduces competition between churches, and the factor of Transplantation. Sociologists have often pointed out the effect of such transplantation on cultures. Thus, the English who went to the American colonies are the U.S. citizens of to-day, a very different proposition. Australians, as the Queen has discovered, are by no means the same as Englishmen, and the American negro is not the same as an African.

This factor also operates in the case of Churches. The Anglican bishop in India in a simple white cassock and worn sandals is by no means the same as the prelates against whom the independents rebelled. And the New England Congregationalist in a totally different environment reacts in not at all the same way as his brother Congregationalist in England with its Established Church. Methodists in India have a different social status from that formerly held by them in England. Bishops of an Anglo-Catholic frame of mind found themselves becoming very evangelical (in the true sense of the word) in South India, and English nonconformists very Catholic.

There can be no doubt of the importance of this factor of Transplantation. And the Comity of Missions helped to prevent sectarianism. Christian bodies with a nonconformist status in England were used by God to found a Church where there had previously been no Church. That this had in fact happened forced many Anglicans to accept a far more positive and realistic view of the ministry in such a Church than they might do in England.

The third factor which must be appreciated is that of Nationalism, the all-important Indian aspect. Indians increasingly wanted an indigenous Church, not an imported Western structure. Had Indians been left to themselves, the Union might well have taken place fifteen years sooner. It is perhaps providential that the Church of South India came into being only a month later than the Indian Republic. Christians in India can never forget their minority status, some 10 million in a population of 350 million, and of these 10 million, more than half are in South India. Of these perhaps half are Roman. Rather more than 1 million have come together in C.S.I. But the evangelization of India has only just begun and it demands a real occulturation of Christianity, though Christians will always have to be watchful as to the danger of syncretism.

The Union has resulted in a very real growing together. Church-

sense is replacing Mission- or Denomination-sense. The new Liturgy shows a fresh appreciation of worship. Church government is transformed, and a primitive pattern of episcopacy is established which has greatly impressed visitors.

In Bangalore where I live the Cathedral has been looked after by an Anglican Brotherhood, while the Bishop, before the Union, was a Methodist minister. In the Cathedral I have assisted at ordinations at which Indians have been ordained Deacon and Presbyter and also a number of Methodist and Congregationalist missionaries. No one could fail to be impressed by this dignified and significant rite; was not this "doing what the Church has always done"?

I recall also the inauguration of the Women's Order at which the first twenty-six Sisters were admitted during the Liturgy. In a simple "habit", a white cotton, blue-bordered sari, they came up to receive the cross of the Order and to return to their several dioceses to live lives of simplicity and devotion under a common rule.

All this betokens growth, but there is willingness to experiment and great self-criticism. How can the Church become self-supporting? What is the contribution of Indian thought to theology? An experiment is being made in a "voluntary" ministry, which may be a return to New Testament practice or something rather like "priest-workmen". Groups in the Church are becoming greatly concerned about the social witness of Christians and the development of lay leadership.

I write this at the end of Holy Week at Kelham. The splendid liturgy of the Week unfolds itself with all its traditional ceremonies in that superb chapel under the Jagger Rood. I covet all this wealth of Christian culture for India and India will appreciate these lives of discipline, but it may be that in South India we also have something to contribute. For the Church is young, faced with great odds; it is a *stripped* Church with a strong sense of eschatology and a growing theology of the Holy Spirit. The young Pilgrim Church and the old culture Church can give to one another.

L. M. Schiff.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. R. Chandran is Principal of the United Theological College, Bangalore.

The Rev. D. Chellappa is Headmaster of St Paul's School, Madras (an S.P.G. foundation), and Editor of the *South India Churchman*.

The Rev. W. Elphick is Principal of Bishop Cotton Boys' School, Bangalore, and Head of the Brotherhood of St Peter. From 1939 to 1947 he was an Hon. Canon of Madras.

The Rev. L. M. Schiff is a member of the staff of the United Theological College, Bangalore, and an S.P.G. missionary.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In the literature dealing with the date of the Last Supper, to which our attention was recalled by Dr Vincent Taylor in the February number of THEOLOGY, I do not remember having seen the one argument which seems to me decisive in favour of Mark's date.

The Passover Meal had to be eaten inside the city of Jerusalem after 6 p.m. (cp. Vincent Taylor on Mark 14. 13).

Now from Mark 11. 11 and 19, we should suppose that during the week immediately before the Passover, Jesus was not lodging in the city at night. Indeed we are told, and 14. 3–9 confirms this, that he was lodging at Bethany. The reasons for his lodging outside the city are doubtless the difficulty of getting lodgings in the city at this time, the fact that he had friends in Bethany, and also the obvious danger of being in the city with its narrow streets at night. Jesus had no intention of being assassinated by some unknown hand. If he was to die he must die as the rejected Messiah.

Now, if Jesus was spending his nights outside the city, there could be nothing to bring him inside the city walls after dark, *except* the Passover meal itself. The story of Mark 14. 12–16 shows the precautions Jesus took to avoid his presence in the city being known before he had accomplished the whole of his purpose. Indeed, if the Last Supper was not the Passover, it can only be said that this story is a complete invention. Any meal other than the Passover, Jesus could have eaten at Bethany or elsewhere without endangering his life in the city at night.

No answer is given here to the numerous difficulties in Mark's dating, but I submit I can see no way of getting round this particular point.

Yours faithfully,

GEOFFREY PAUL.

KERALA UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
TRIVANDRUM, SOUTH INDIA.

THE INTERCESSION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Your readers are indebted to Mr Sansbury for noting the distinction between a prayer of intercession which takes account of the apostolic injunction, and prays for *all men*, and one which limits its scope to the whole state of Christ's Church. They may also be surprised to reflect that, in spite of St Paul, the Prayer Book restricts nearly all its intercessory matter, both in the offices and the Eucharist, to the Church. The Litany is an exception to this, but the Litany

was not primarily intended as an act of intercession, and in any case is comparatively little used to-day. Apart from the Litany, the *only* intercessory prayer in the book which steps outside the bounds of the Church is the prayer for All Conditions of Men.

That our solemn intercessions should be offered for all men without restriction is the express injunction of St Paul, and we are surely not mistaken in thinking it to be the will of our Lord. Considerations of liturgical history apart, it is difficult to accept Mr Sansbury's contention that such a prayer ought not to be offered within the course of the eucharistic action. The sacrifice of the cross was made for the salvation of all men, and if a prayer for all men is to be made at all, it seems doubtful if a more suitable occasion could be found than at the very heart of the eucharist. If our Lord upon the cross could pray, "Father, forgive them", then surely the best place to pray for those who wander outside the Church is "over the sacrifice". As we kneel before the altar, virtually at the foot of the cross, it seems more than a little parochial to suggest that we must restrict our prayers to the Church alone.

I suspect that Mr Sansbury agrees with this: his argument is explicitly based upon the grounds of liturgical history, to which I should now like to turn, for it would be interesting to know what his grounds are. It is true that the intercessions in the ancient liturgies which are not limited to the Church, but attempt to cover all humanity, are perhaps always found at some point before the offertory: The Deacon's Litany of the Apostolic Constitutions, the Orationes Solemnes of the ancient Roman Rite, and the intercessions indicated by St Justin in his description of the Baptismal Mass, are cases in point. It is to be noted that these are our earliest examples where it is possible to be at all precise about the position and contents of the prayers. It is also true that in later years the Church showed a preference for drawing its intercessions within the eucharistic action, and offering them over the sacrifice; and it is certainly a fact that these later prayers showed a far more restricted and exclusive spirit than the catholic and all-embracing charity of the earlier ones. Does Mr. Sansbury suggest that this change in the character of the prayers is to be explained simply by the change in their position? I suggest that we are equally justified in explaining it as a result of a certain degeneracy or loss of vision. When the peace of the Church had been won, and Christendom established, no doubt the needs of those outside the Church seemed less urgent, and a prayer for the Church alone, dividing it at length into its various classes and orders, seemed sufficient. With heathenism far away on the frontiers of civilization, and odd pockets of heresy or paganism appearing only small and insignificant, it was perhaps natural that the Church, perceiving herself to be practically coterminous with society, should be content to pray for herself alone.

To-day, the Church of England is no longer co-terminous with English society, and the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church is most inadequate. We live in the hopes that one day our authorities will provide us with a more adequate intercession for the Eucharist,

praying for all men. I should be grateful if Mr Sansbury would correct me, and show the traditional grounds why this prayer may not be placed after the offertory.

Culgaith Vicarage,
Penrith.

Yours sincerely,
E. C. Whitaker.

Canon Sansbury writes:

I was not so bold as to say that intercessions for those outside the Church "ought not" to be offered within the central action of the Eucharist, only that, "if tradition is to be any guide", they would not be offered there. I was concerned to point out a distinction between the two kinds of Intercession to which Prof. Ratcliff had kindly called my attention and which ought, I submit, to be taken into account by future revisers, if we are to avoid the confusion of prayers ostensibly for the whole state of Christ's Church which then proceed to include everybody and everything. As to the ultimate reason for the restricted character of intercessions "over the altar", it lies surely in the fact that from the beginning the Eucharist was a family act. "While . . . public intercession 'by categories' sufficed at the synaxis, the eucharist even in pre-Nicene times was felt to require something more personal, as the domestic gathering of the household of God" (*Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 498).

We are not bound by tradition for ever, and Mr Whitaker's plea for a break from traditional usage (and presumably for a general intercession after the Prayer of Consecration) deserves consideration. The arguments against it are in part practical—such a lengthy prayer may not be too much for hardy Scottish Episcopalians, but is, I believe, beyond the capacity of the average English worshipper; and in part liturgical—surely the right line of development is to make the "four-action" shape dominant in the Eucharist proper and to keep all other elements subsidiary. The problem of the Intercession, however (as of other elements, e.g. the penitential section), admits of no easy solution and the important thing at the moment is that there should be thought and discussion on the matter.

HYMNALS AND HISTORY

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In reading Mr Donovan's article on Hymnals and History in your May number, I noted some slips and omissions to which he may be glad to have his attention called.

"Lord, in this thy mercy's day" was not written by Isaac Williams *as a hymn*, but is an extract from his long poem, *The Baptistery* (published by Parker of Oxford in 1842), written to accompany his republication of Boetius a Bolswert's "Illustrations" of Sucquet's *Via Vitae Activiae* (Antwerp, 1630).

The church whose hymn-book was at one time *The Hymnary* of 1872 was St Andrew's, *Wells* (not *Well*) Street. The musical editor, Joseph (afterwards Sir Joseph) Barnby, was its organist: he was not in orders and so not, as Mr Donovan calls him, "Rev." The vicar (my father, Benjamin Webb) was co-editor with Canon William Cooke, on whom an article will be found in Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*. He himself had been one of the original editors of *Hymnal Noted*.

Old Rectory,
Pitchcott,
Aylesbury.

Yours very truly,
Clement C. J. Webb.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I feel bound to demur when your contributor, the Rev. Marcus Donovan, writes that Neale's Ember hymn "Christ is gone up" is "a model of what a teaching hymn should be". This hymn contains the dreadful lines:

And still the holy Church is here,
Although her Lord is gone.

The holy Church seems to have usurped the place of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.

Yours, etc.,

ST DAVID'S COLLEGE, LAMPETER.

REGINALD H. FULLER.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA: THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS UNION. 1900–1947. By Bengt Sundkler. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

This work might well have been introduced with a recital—*mutatis mutandis*—of the prologue to St Luke's Gospel. Narratives concerning the movement towards union in South India have issued in profusion during the past thirty-five years: eye-witnesses, visitors, advocates and opponents have all had their say on the various "Schemes" and it seemed well-nigh impossible that anything further of real relevance could now be said. That such was not the case Dr Sundkler's book is the answer. In fact, it meets precisely the need that has long been felt by all who have the cause of church union at heart, in particular those who have been, and still are, most intimately connected with this important adventure in South India: that is an authentic, impartial, and detailed presentation of the whole story, set against the background of ecumenical development and the vast changes in Indian affairs culminating in constitutional autonomy under the Indian Independence Act 1947. *Church of South India: The movement towards Union, 1900–1947* supplies this lacuna in fullest measure, and—not least important—it has appeared at a most propitious moment, since in 1955, in pursuance of resolutions agreed by all four Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1950, the Church of England will have to review its relations with the Church of South India.

The author of this work is Dr Bengt Sundkler, a minister in the Church of Sweden and Professor of Missions in Uppsala University. After service in the mission field in South and East Africa he was Research Secretary of the International Missionary Council, a post which provided exceptional experience in missionary problems over a wide field. To essay a work of such scope as the present volume was no slight undertakng for one who was neither a member of any of the churches involved in the union, nor had the advantage of first-hand knowledge of India. On the other hand, these disabilities have not only been surmounted, but there is evidence in every chapter of

the book of a breadth of view and impartiality that a writer personally associated with the movement at the centre would have found more difficult.

Professor Sundkler equipped himself for his task—which has occupied seven years—by an exhaustive study of every document that has any bearing upon the subject, by personal interviews with a large number of people representing widely diverse views, and later by a visit of several months to South India after the inauguration of the Scheme in 1947. In the introduction and fourteen chapters which embody the fruit of these patient labours the author has "traced the course of all things accurately from the first" with a clarity, honesty, and attractiveness for which—whatever the reader's personal convictions may be concerning some of the theological views expressed—every student of church history and the urgent problem of church union will be profoundly grateful.

In the opening words of his introductory chapter Dr Sundkler pinpoints the basic fact whence so many of the problems in missionary enterprise emerge: "The day when a church becomes a sending church, a missionary church, is among the most fateful in its history. When it moves across the seas to be transplanted in other soil, it does of necessity change, either by conscious and willing adaptation or else through its very resistance to change. The factors of growth and change are set out in sharper relief by the situation in a mission field than by the situation within the older churches of Europe and America. Transplantation is mutation." To illustrate this influence of the "soil" when whole religions are moved from one culture to another he goes on to cite Buddhism when transplanted from India into Tibet, China, and Japan; the impact of Greek thought upon Christianity, and later that of Rome when it succeeded Jerusalem as the centre of the primitive Church. How clearly this influence has been evident in the course of the Anglican Church in India: in no extension of our communion overseas has it been more fully exemplified. As with the British Raj, so it was with the coming of the English Church, its entry into India was purely accidental: it all began with trade. For the first two centuries it was the antithesis of a missionary church. By the time it became fully organized, however, we find its leaders not only conscious of the need of freedom, but exploring the possibilities of attaining a greater measure of autonomy. That gesture was inspired by the desire to build up a truly indigenous church for the peoples of India and was embodied in a Pastoral issued by the Episcopal Conference "to all people of whatever race and religion in India and Ceylon" in 1883. The relevant section is of considerable interest in the light of subsequent developments in the Church of India and its relationship to the Church of South India:

> "We do not aim at imposing upon an Indian Church anything which is distinctively English or even European. The Word, the Sacraments and the Episcopal Ministry—these are unchangeable. They belong to no age or country. As they met the needs of Europe or of Asia many centuries ago, they will meet the needs of the India of to-day. But in regard to the conditions under which these are presented, the Church adapts herself, and we desire to see her adapt herself more and more, to the circumstances and

> to the tempers of every race of men; and from these, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, her forms of service, her customs and rules and institutions will take an impress. We trust that God has given this mission to the Church of England, to give to India that pure Truth, and that divinely appointed Order, in possession of which India shall work out her own spiritual life, bear spiritual fruit of her own, contribute her own spiritual gifts to the wealth of the universal Church of God."

From 1883 the urge for constitutional reform within the Church steadily increased both in intensity and tempo until the goal was reached. The ultimate issue of that movement was the passing of the Indian Church Measure, and the Indian Church Bill in 1927 whereby the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon received complete freedom to acclimatize and develop the Church on Indian soil untrammelled by the legal impediments which establishment had previously imposed. On the wisdom and vision of those leaders by whose patient labours and statesmanship that great freedom was attained history will pay its tribute in due course. Throughout the long and tedious process of that movement for autonomy they were conscious of the force of Dr Sundkler's thesis that "transplantation is mutation", and, moreover, in framing their Constitution, Canons, and Rules, were careful to make provision for the possibility and conditions of union with other churches in India, Burma, or Ceylon.

In the chapters which follow the author gives us an outline of the nineteenth-century background, beginning with the Evangelical Revival in England and its influence upon the Anglican Communion and the Free Churches in England, America, and later on missionary co-operation in India. It is at this point in the story that we begin to see the influence of Indian Nationalism upon the Christian Church, in particular in South India, and the various movements which led to the formation of the South Indian United Church. Of those early days Dr Sundkler gives us a detailed and graphic résumé, concluding with what is, in fact, an extraordinarily accurate picture of the situation as it was in India at the beginning of the present century: "The Westerners may have had their ecclesiastical struggles and squabbles: nationalism was drawing the Indian community together as a unity over against the foreigners. It also influenced Indian Christians to come together."

Then follows the history of the inception of the South Indian United Church, with the ultimate union of the churches founded by Presbyterian, British and American Congregationalist, and Swiss Evangelical Missions, and the Methodist Church in South India, originally Wesleyan. This was the first major fence to negotiate, but it was cleared without disaster, and a solid foundation laid for further advance towards the goal of unity among the Christian Churches in India. Meanwhile, on the Anglican side activities were afoot. In 1899 Henry Whitehead, a former Superior of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, was appointed to the see of Madras. Being of the Tractarian tradition the new Bishop was regarded with suspicion in the evangelical diocese of Madras, but the record of his episcopate provides another illustration of Sundkler's contention that "Transplantation is mutation"—it applies to persons as to churches. At its

close, twenty-three years later, the Methodist editor of *Harvest Field* could say of him "that Whitehead had come to play a leading role in the union movement, and that during his service in Madras he had swung over from a rigid Tractarian viewpoint to large-hearted ecumenicity" .In the neighbouring dioceses of Dornakal and Tinnevelly Bishops Azariah and Waller were equally sympathetic and co-operative, and each made valuable contributions to the movement towards union.

The next landmark to which Dr Sundkler directs our attention is Edinburgh and what followed. It is at this point in the movement that fresh impulses come into play and new names appear in its deliberations—Edwin James Palmer, Bishop of Bombay, George Alfred Lefroy of Lahore, and Reginald Stephen Copleston, Metropolitan, on the Anglican side; J. P. Jones, J. S. M. Hooper, J. S. Chandler, Dr J. H. Wycloff, G. S. Eddy, K. T. Paul, and many others, representing the South Indian United Church. On the place which Bishop Palmer held in the counsels of the movement, and the contribution he made to the cause of union, it is unnecessary to comment. In the early days of his episcopate (1909) he stated his views on reunion in his *Diocesan Record*: "My ideal of the basis of reunion cannot be a Greatest Common Factor. That is a position which either makes our present Church principles untenable, or is untenable itself. . . . How dare we call our differences unimportant? How dare we be content with a reunion which neglects them? Then, away with the Greatest Common Factor basis of reunion."

The author guides us through the protracted and tangled course of the movement with singular clarity up to the historic Tranquebar Conference in 1919, the outcome of which was the Tranquebar Manifesto—a joint statement drawn up by members of the Anglican Communion and the South Indian United Church. It was on this manifesto, with the Lambeth Quadrilateral as the basis of union, that negotiations between the uniting churches continued.

In the subsequent chapters Dr Sundkler takes his readers on a skilfully conducted tour through the intricate outworks between 1919 and the inauguration of the ecclesiastical union on 27 September 1947. In his concluding chapter—*The end which is the Beginning*—the author gives us a moving picture of the Inauguration service in St George's Cathedral, Madras. This and the previous chapter—*The Beginning of the End*—are the high-lights in a volume of singularly attractive reading and of exceptional importance at this time. Upon the Union itself the Catholic Church will pass its verdict in the fullness of time. Whatever that verdict may be, and however widely personal views concerning the Church of South India may differ, few can doubt that unparalleled opportunities lie before it: well expressed by the preacher at the Inauguration service, "The reconciliation between our divergent elements . . . enables us with fresh conviction and force to proclaim the Gospel of reconciliation to all the clashing elements in this nation's life."

Throughout, Dr Sundkler's work bears the marks of careful and exhaustive research, combined with sound scholarship and imagina-

tion. Not least valuable are the notes on each chapter with meticulous references, the excellent bibliography, the maps, and the instructive statement on pp. 216–17 showing the changes made in the various editions of the Schemes from 1929 to 1941.

Here, for the first time, we have the complete story of the C.S.I., a reliable textbook. It is written by one who is obviously inspired by the same convictions as moved the authors[1] to write that splendid essay on the Lambeth Appeal of 1920:

"The Church is the serving body of the naked suffering Christ of Calvary, now risen and ascended. Its true place is at humanity's feet. Because it rose from that place and sought to share the thrones of kings and the chairs of philosophers, it has been broken into fragments, and lost the loyalty of countless of its members. God is now calling it back to the place he gave it; the place he himself never leaves. If the Church will hearken, and humble itself, it will be exalted, with him, to the seat of real power, which is spiritual. In him it will recover its brotherly love, its united fellowship, and its power to save and sanctify the human race."

PETERBOROUGH. JOHN GRIMES.

EPISCOPACY AND REUNION. By E. R. Fairweather and R. F. Hettlinger. Mowbrays. 12s. 6d.

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE IN THE FULLNESS OF THE CHURCH. Seven Essays by Priests of the Church of England. Edited by K. M. Carey. Dacre Press. 8s. 6d.

In 1955 the Church of England must reconsider the indecisive verdict pronounced in 1950 on the question of its relations with the Church of South India; and the approaching end of the moratorium brings to the fore once again the problem of "episcopacy and reunion", which lies at the core of the impasse confronting the Anglican Communion. Accordingly these two books are warmly to be welcomed, both for their intrinsic interest and for their relevance to this issue. The former is a friendly interchange of papers between two Canadian professors, Dr Fairweather of Trinity College, and Mr Hettlinger of Wycliffe College, Toronto, representing respectively the Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical schools of churchmanship; and the latter a domestic production, a symposium by seven members of Westcott House, Cambridge, all writing from the standpoint of avowed highchurchmen, though in reaction against the rigidity of the straitest sect of that tradition. In combination therefore the two studies form a most serviceable introduction to the debate, which the Convocations cannot evade during the next twelvemonth.

The Canadian volume illustrates admirably the presuppositions of the two schools of churchmanship in approaching the question of the relations of episcopal and non-episcopal churches. Both Professor Fairweather and Professor Hettlinger admit that the New Testament evidence in respect of episcopacy is equivocal; and the former allows

[1] Frank Theodore Woods, Frank Weston, and Martin Linton Smith.

in regard to bishops and presbyters that "the evidence seems to imply their essential identity during the New Testament period", and that the evidence of the sub-apostolic age is not free from similar uncertainties. Moreover, he throws over "the rather doubtfully useful idea of the *shaliach*"; and with it the notion of the episcopate as alone constituting "the essential ministry". "To describe the episcopate, then, as 'the Essential Ministry', or to speak of the presbyterate as if its exercise of sacerdotal functions had no basis in its own character as an order, but depended simply on the will of the episcopate or the instinct of the Church, is indefensible" (p. 22). In order to bridge the gaps in the historical evidence for the origins of episcopacy, therefore, Dr Fairweather introduces certain *a priori* assumptions: that "apostolic continuity is made the tabernacle of the life and acts of Christ"; and that "the apostolic function can never cease to be needed in the Christian society, which means that certain persons must succeed to the office of apostleship . . . it is for this reason that episcopacy is accepted throughout Catholic Christendom as the apostolic ministry *par excellence*" (pp. 4, 8). Granted these premises, it is natural that his conclusions should follow: that "the Church . . . is itself the end"; that "the visible Church . . . is the one sacrament of grace for the whole human race"; that the church's "wholeness of form includes three elements: (*a*) the liturgical pattern of the Christian sacraments, (*b*) the doctrinal pattern of the Christian faith, and (*c*) the hierarchical pattern of the Christian ministry"; and that "not only *a* ministry, then, but *the* ministry is so much a part of the Church's God-given life that its destruction would mean the disappearance of the Church of God as God founded it through Christ and his Apostles" (pp. 25, 26, 27, 30–31). It is important to realize that these concepts are not derived from the historical evidence of the New Testament concerning the origins of the episcopate, but from presuppositions imposed upon it, which determine the interpretation of that evidence. In his dissertation on *The Christian Ministry*, Lightfoot remarked that "the doctrine in this instance at all events is involved in the history". But the new dogmatism holds that the history must subserve the doctrine. The weakness of this position is that it leads not only to episcopacy but to papacy; for *a priori* arguments about the unity of the Church fit as naturally, to say the least, into the Roman as into the Anglo-Catholic conception of the Church.

Accordingly Dr Fairweather, like Agag, treads delicately when negotiating historical facts. For example, his statement that "the most striking fact of all, however, as far as the question of sacramental succession is concerned, is the complete absence from the first fifteen centuries of Christian history of positive evidence for the ordination of bishops or presbyters by anyone except an apostle or apostolic bishop" (p. 8), would need considerable revision in the light of Dr W. Telfer's article on "Episcopal Succession in Egypt" in the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* for April 1952, or that by Professor Einar Molland on "Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the Apostolic Succession" in the issue of April 1950. Nor is Dr Fairweather more fortunate

when dealing with "Anglicanism and Ecumenicity". To dismiss the allowance of a valid ministry and sacraments to foreign non-episcopal churches by the long series of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Anglican divines, many of whom adorn the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, as "widespread Anglican opportunism" (p. 46), or "certain anomalies in the past" (p. 49), or as "laxist Anglicans" (p. 50), argues a like unfamiliarity with the history of these epochs. The explanation offered for these aberrations, that their authors were misled "by a certain misunderstanding of the continental Reformation" (p. 57), is open, of course, to the retort courteous that perhaps, being more nearly contemporary with that movement than Dr Fairweather, they were less mistaken in their understanding of it than himself. Certainly a writer who dismisses the sixteenth-century doctrine of the godly prince with two passing references to "royal tyranny" and "caesaro-papism" is hardly qualified to understand the reformation. He protests in passing against the "selective presentation of the case" by the bishop of Chichester and myself; though his own standards of impartiality permit him to cite Bishop Seabury and to make no mention of his contemporary Bishop White. In point of fact a much stronger case for the Anglican view of episcopacy (as well as for the approval of foreign reformed churches) can be made than that offered by Dr Fairweather; but since I hope to deal with this issue historically and at length in the Gunning lectures at Edinburgh University, I will pass it by now. His own conclusion that "we must choose, then, between the Catholic pattern in its integrity, to which the logic of Anglican history binds us, and compromises which would commit us to a profoundly different interpretation of Christianity" (p. 61), is based upon a "logic of history" which contradicts the facts of Anglican history. Here, unfortunately, Dr Fairweather is a partisan.

Notwithstanding, he is not opposed to all concessions. "Once the principles of Catholicity on which the [Lambeth] Quadrilateral is founded are really understood and sincerely accepted, a good many anomalies can temporarily be tolerated, provided that they are clearly recognized as both anomalous and temporary. For example, a temporarily incomplete unification of ministries might be accepted in a particular area, without affecting the relation of the Anglicans concerned to their fellows elsewhere, or intercommunion might be achieved between ourselves and a church in communion with other churches with which we cannot be in communion" (p. 49). It is pleasing to record this triumph of charity over rubrics, which suggests that despite himself the author has imbibed some of the spirit of those "laxist Anglicans" of earlier centuries, whom in general he rebukes.

Professor Hettlinger stands more firmly and securely upon the historical evidence than his colleague in authorship. He emphasizes the admitted fact that originally apostolic succession signified the succession of bishops in a see as assurance of continuity of doctrine, and not the tactual succession by consecration. From which he observes that Anglican apologists, such as Jewel and Hooker, attached

greater importance to maintenance of sound doctrine than of tactual consecration. If historical circumstances compelled the harsh necessity of choice between the restoration of true faith and the maintenance of episcopal succession, then the lesser must give place to the greater, and episcopacy be sacrificed. Dr Fairweather never faces squarely this historical issue. His colleague accepts it as true of the sixteenth-century reformers. Furthermore he points out that the iterated statement "that the Church of England lacks a doctrine of the Church" really amounts to no more than that "the Church of England lacks the narrow doctrine of the Church which some of her members wish she held" (p. 83). His statement of the traditional Anglican position is one which the present reviewer, having had occasion to re-read recently the majority of Anglican apologists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is convinced to be correct. His conclusion is that episcopacy is not of the *esse* but of the *bene esse* of the Church; and that the decision of the Anglican Communion should be in favour of the Church of South India.

It is at this point that *The Historic Episcopate* takes up the argument, and gives it another direction. The contributors all avow themselves "in fact Highchurchmen, in the sense that we all hold a high doctrine of the Church and believe in the exercise of the apostolic ministry of the whole Church through the historic episcopate". Nevertheless, they are alienated by the rigidity of *The Apostolic Ministry*, and seek a *via media* between its dogmas and the view that episcopacy is only of the *bene esse* of the church. It is commonly urged against the latter position that it embodies a merely historical view of episcopacy (though this indeed need be no cause for shame in a historical religion), and lacks a theological doctrine. Dr J. A. T. Robinson therefore strikes the first blow at *The Apostolic Ministry* by arguing that its theology is at fault. His principle is to subordinate the Church to the Kingdom. "Ultimately the New Testament subordinates the Church to the Kingdom": and his conclusion sets the tone of the whole book. "What we are concerned to deny (as unbiblical, unhistorical, and unanglican) is a particular interpretation of the episcopate, which would automatically unchurch any part of the Body that for historical reasons has failed to preserve it. For that is to exalt it as a precondition of the Church, whereas the only precondition of the Church is the Kingdom of God. We affirm that the episcopate is dependent on the Church, and not the Church on the episcopate. We believe its possession to be a necessary mark of the Church's fullness, rather than an indispensable qualification for being a part" (p. 22). Dr Robinson's important and weighty chapter is followed by Mr W. H. Vanstone's on the Ministry in the New Testament; which finds the evidence for episcopacy indeterminate. Mr K. Woolcombe examines the patristic evidence for the ministry and order of the Church, and deals further blows at the carcass of the late Dom Gregory Dix's essay in *The Apostolic Ministry*. His deductions are that "the Church gradually moves into the present custom of episcopal consecration"; and that it "is the glory of the Fathers . . . that they were charitable men—that it was their

first aim to heal and to restore—and that they saw everything they did, not against the background of some minor anomaly in their own local churches, but against the background of the Salvation of the Nations" (p. 62). There follow two historical surveys of the Anglican attitude towards episcopacy, Mr B. D. Till dealing with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and Mr Alan Webster with the nineteenth century; and both concluding that the rigidity of the Tractarian position was untypical of the traditional Anglican doctrine. Mr H. W. Montefiore then develops in detail the principle laid down in the first chapter, that episcopacy, whilst not of the *esse* of the Church, nor yet sufficiently described as of its *bene esse*, is best conceived as being of the *plene esse* of the Church. This he supports by an exegesis of *pleroma* and its cognates in the New Testament. The final chapter, from the pen of the Principal of Westcott House, is a singularly courageous and forthright application of the foregoing principles to the Church of South India and a convinced plea for its recognition by the Church of England, and the establishment of relations of full communion. Mr Carey considers five practical difficulties in the way of such recognition, and sums up against their cogency. His essay is impassioned, bold, and constructive in its plea for adherence to the traditional Anglican attitude and approach.

It would seem therefore that the rigid position as regards episcopacy, as represented not only by *The Apostolic Ministry* but also by the modified version of Professor Fairweather, has received some mortal blows. The New Testament cannot be forced on to its Procrustean bed; the historical evidence of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages is insufficiently determinate; whilst the Anglican tradition tells decisively against it. To cover up these defects, appeal is made to *a priori* assumptions, themselves of course susceptible to challenge. The present reviewer is not wholly convinced of the superiority of the description *plene esse* over that of *bene esse*; but it can claim the precedents and usage of Joseph Hall and Bramhall, and even of the Romanist Thomas Stapleton. It may therefore be accepted as an adequate definition of the Anglican standpoint. What is most welcome in *The Historic Episcopate* is its provenance from Westcott House. If these *septem contra mundum* represent a new emphasis within highchurchmanship, there is good hope for the restoration and reaffirmation of the traditional Anglican standpoint. Their volume (which is both important and challenging) should be carefully read and pondered.

CAMBRIDGE. NORMAN SYKES.

NEW TESTAMENT PATTERN. The "catholic" and "protestant" dualism. By Jean-Louis Leuba. Lutterworth Press. 17s. 6d.

THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD. By Lesslie Newbigin. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Here are two valuable contributions to the recovery of the unity of the faith and so of the Church itself. Dr Leuba and Bishop Newbigin approach their subject from opposite but complementary

angles, while they share the conviction that neither of the great traditions, Catholic and Protestant, which debate with one another in the ecumenical movement, can be regarded as simply erroneous, for each can appeal to important elements in the theology of the New Testament. Dr Leuba begins with the New Testament, and finds in it dogmatic implications of ecumenical importance, while Bishop Newbigin, beginning from the traditions we know to-day, finds them windows to a deeper understanding of the New Testament message itself. Both find the New Testament faith richer and profounder than any one of our traditions in isolation from the rest.

Dr Leuba discovers running through every level of New Testament theology two strands, that of the "institution" and the "event", two modes of God's working, different, but united in his divine action. To identify these strands with Catholic and Protestant theologies as we know them to-day, as his translator does in the new title he has given to the English edition of Leuba's book *L'institution et l'événement*, which has already created wide interest on the Continent, is to make an over-simplification which Leuba himself avoids; but there is sufficient connexion to justify us in concluding that if Leuba is right we cannot state the full faith of the New Testament without giving full weight to the distinctive contentions of both Catholic and Protestant thought. Leuba's work is avowedly exegetical, and it must in the end be judged by his fellow-exegetes; but its implications for dogmatics and so for the ecumenical debate justify its consideration here. He sees running through the whole theology of the New Testament a fundamental dualism whose ultimate basis is no doubt the dualism of creation and redemption, and of old and new covenant. In both the old is neither superseded by the new nor renders it superfluous; the two retain their identity and operation in a living unity. In Christology there is the dualism of Messiah and Lord, Son of David and Son of Man: yet the Christ is the Lord and the Lord is the Christ, and cannot be the one except by being the other. In the Apostolic Ministry there is the dualism of the "institutional apostolate" of the Twelve and the "charismatic apostolate" of Paul: yet the Twelve recognize Paul and depend upon him for the fulfilment of their own universal ministry, while Paul recognizes the ministry of the Twelve and depends upon the primitive evangelical tradition of which they are the bearers. In the Church, there is the dualism of the institutional Church of Jewish Christianity, with its centre at Jerusalem, and the spiritual Churches of Gentile Christianity, springing up everywhere by the Spirit's action: yet the Jewish Church recognizes and accepts the Gentile Church, while the Gentile Church recognizes the Jewish Church and regards it as its own parent body. Throughout, to overstress the institutional element would lead to a Judaizing heresy, to overstress the spiritual element would lead to a Marcionite heresy. The institution, says Leuba, is like a row of noughts, the event like the preceding figure 1 which makes them into a million: divine action needs a historical embodiment, but historical institutions are nothing without the breath of the Spirit.

Clearly Leuba has hit upon something which is actually there in the New Testament. But the outworking of his thesis is almost unbelievably neat. Is this tidy dialectical scheme really in the N.T., or has it been imposed upon it by the mind of an investigator trained by Continental theology to think in dialectical patterns? Can such sharp distinctions be drawn between the two strands, granted they exist? What is the significance of the incorporation into Gentile Christianity of the essential features of Jewish Christianity, after the fall of Jerusalem and before the close of the canonical period? Apparently the ecumenical goal is to be not the fusion of the two strands, as in primitive Catholicism, but their dialectical juxtaposition: in terms of to-day, Catholic and Protestant are to recognize one another but remain themselves. Bishop Newbigin can explain to us why this will not do.

Bishop Newbigin is surely right in drawing our attention to three main theological positions with which we must reckon, although the third, the "Pentecostal", has had little part in the ecumenical movement so far. They are answers to the question, "What is the manner of our ingrafting into Christ?" The Protestant reply is that we are incorporated into Christ by hearing and believing the Gospel; the Catholic, that it is by sacramental participation in the life of the historically continuous Church; the Pentecostal, that it is by receiving and abiding in the Holy Spirit. All three answers are true, and all are valued in part by every tradition; but different traditions make one or another the determinative centre of their theologies. But none of the answers is adequate in isolation from the others to be such a determinative centre, and where it is made such, distortions result. All this is well said and carries conviction both exegetically and in terms of the ecumenical debate. Bishop Newbigin's own contribution to the solution of the problem seems less persuasive: he believes that justice can be done to all three only if we view the Church eschatologically and in terms of its missionary task, "in the perspective of the ends of the earth and of the end of the world". These contentions are again true, but not if we isolate them from other things which must also be said. To say that the Church must find its *esse* not in what it is but in what it is to become, not in its inward being but in its task of mission, is surely but to restate in other terms that view which finds the determinative centre in hearing and believing the Gospel. Newbigin's thought has matured since he wrote *The Reunion of the Church*, and he has understood and assimilated many things that seem vital to a Catholic, but he remains fundamentally a Protestant, and so stands under the judgment of his own thesis. But the thesis and the method are untouched by this criticism, and they might be adopted with even greater fruitfulness by one starting from the Catholic end, provided such a writer could emulate the Bishop's theological seriousness and passion for unity. In the end, however, we may wonder whether there is any other starting-point than the Person and work of the Head of the Church himself, and this is that now adopted by Faith and Order.

Neither of these books gives us a solution to the problem of re-

integrating our divided theologies. Both however bear witness to a growing agreement among ecumenical theologians that the Church and its unity are both eschatological and historical realities, and that if we are to find our unity in the one revelation we must learn to do full justice to both sides. Neither these writers nor anyone else has yet shown convincingly how we are to see the unity of these two elements; to do so is now the real task of ecumenical theology.

WILLIAM NICHOLLS.

WENDOVER.

SHORTER NOTICES

HOLY MASS: APPROACHES TO THE MYSTERY. By A.-M. Roguet, O.P. Blackfriars. Paper: 5s. Cloth: 7s. 6d.

A Pope once urged Papists to "pray the Mass". Now a Papist urges Papists to "live by the Mass" (p. 119). A Catholic commonplace? Yes. But seldom have common life and common prayer been so synoptically viewed in so small a compass. (A pity that translation and punctuation were not rechecked before publication!)

This book "stinketh of oblation". So does the Gospel. Why not, then, the Mass? Père Roguet defends the offertory oblation of bread and wine as likewise of alms, but finds no room upon his altar for perambulators or pick-axes, which for him only obscure the real Sacrifice (p. 44).

For him the real Sacrifice consists in the Mystical Body's oblation of the Eucharistic Body and Blood. But like Aquinas he interprets the "haec perferri" of the *Supplices te rogamus* as referring to an oblation of ourselves (p. 103). Right or wrong, this is support for those Anglicans who would place such an oblation within the Canon.

A far remove from "living by the Mass"? No. Life, devotion, and theology are here inextricably entangled. We cannot live by the Mass if we do not pray the Mass; we cannot pray the Mass if our theology is wrong.

MITCHAM. RAYMOND SKINNER.

WHAT IS THIS CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA? By Douglas Webster. Highway Press. 1s. 6d.

There appear still to be many churchpeople who have scarcely heard of the Church of South India, and who certainly know practically nothing about it. This booklet might with advantage be commended to their attention. It is clearly, attractively and sympathetically written.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: W. R. Bowie, *Preaching* ($2.75).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Alban G. Widgery, *What is Religion?* (18s.).

AUGUSTINE PRESS: Walton Hannah, *Christian by Degrees: Masonic Religion revealed in the Light of Faith*, with a foreword by E. L. Mascall (12s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: Adam Fox, *John Mill and Richard Bentley* (25s.).

BOWES AND BOWES: Enid Starkie, *André Gide* (6s.); Rayner Heppenstall, *Léon Bloy* (6s.); Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., *Mauriac* (6s.).

CASTERMAN (TOURNAI): *Morale chrétienne et requêtes contemporaires* (90 Belgian francs).

PETER DAVIES: Peter Marshall, *Mr Jones, Meet the Master* (10s. 6d.).

DESCLÉE ET CIE (TOURNAI): L. Vaganay, *Le Problème Synoptique* (200 Belgian francs).

DUCKWORTH: Alexander Souter, revised by C. S. C. Williams, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (8s. 6d.).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: Göte Hedenquist (Ed.), *The Church and the Jewish People* (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Josef Pieper, *The End of Time—A Meditation on the Philosophy of History* (10s. 6d.).

GOLLANCZ: J. Krishnamurti, *The First and Last Freedom* (13s. 6d.); Alexandra Tolstoy, *Tolstoy: A Life of My Father* (30s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: R. H. Thouless, *Authority and Freedom—Some Psychological Problems of Religious Belief* (8s. 6d.); E. Stanley Jones, *Growing Spiritually* (9s. 6d.).

HUTCHINSON'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: E. G. Parrinder, *African Traditional Religion* (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Dom Mark Pontifex, *Belief in the Trinity* (5s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Joost de Blank, *The Parish in Action* (9s. 6d.); R. P. Stacy Waddy, *Philip Loyd: Missionary and Bishop* (10s. 6d.); Shirley Hughson, O.H.C., *Spiritual Guidance* (12s. 6d.); Lumsden Barkway, *An Introduction to the Inner Life* (6s.).

OMEGA PRESS: Lawrence Hyde, *I Who Am—A Study of the Self* (15s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: D. M. Mackinnon, *On the Notion of a Philosophy of History* (2s.); C. E. Raven, *Organic Design* (2s. 6d.); Paul Tillich, *Love, Power, and Justice* (10s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: N. J. Bull, *The Rise of the Prophets* (7s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: T. H. Robinson, *Job and his Friends* (7s. 6d.); Eduard Nielsen, *Oral Tradition* (7s.); E. R. Hardy (Ed.), *Christology of the Later Fathers* (*The Library of Christian Classics, Volume II*) (30s.); J. K. S. Reid (Tr.), *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (*The Library of Christian Classics, Volume XXII*) (30s.); A. C. Craig, *Preaching in a Scientific Age* (7s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Karl Adam, *One and Holy* (7s. 6d.) [The French edition of this book was noticed in THEOLOGY, May 1950, pp. 161 f.]; E. I. Watkin, *Bow in the Clouds* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: C. J. Stranks, *The Church—What it is and what it does* [Material for discussion groups] (2s. 6d.); A. B. Webster, *Joshua Watson: The Story of a Layman, 1771–1855* (15s.); Ragnar Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror* (25s.); G. P. H. Pawson, *Edward Keble Talbot: his Community and his Friends* (17s. 6d.); E. W. Kemp, *N. P. Williams* (21s.).

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM: Alan Richardson, *Religious Truth in an Age of Science* [Inaugural Lecture] (1s. 6d.).

VANTAGE PRESS: F. Hastings Smyth, *Sacrifice: A Doctrinal Homily* ($2.75).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON